



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant : Kumar et al.

Serial No.: 09/136,483

Filed : August 19, 1998

For : ALUMINUM OXIDE PARTICLES

Docket No.: N19.12-0016

Group Art Unit: 1755

Examiner: M.
Marcheschi

REQUEST FOR ORAL HEARING

BOX AF
Assistant Commissioner for Patents
Washington, D.C. 20231

I HEREBY CERTIFY THAT THIS PAPER IS
BEING SENT BY U.S. MAIL, FIRST
CLASS, TO THE ASSISTANT
COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS,
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20231, THIS

02 DAY OF January, 2001
Peter S. Dardi
PATENT ATTORNEY

Sir:

Under the provisions of 37 C.F.R. §1.194(b), Appellants respectfully request an oral hearing for the appeal of the above noted patent application. A check for \$135.00 is enclosed.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any fee deficiency required by this paper or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 23-1123.

Respectfully submitted,

WESTMAN, CHAMPLIN & KELLY, P.A.

By: *Peter S. Dardi*
Peter S. Dardi, Ph.D., Reg. No. 39,650
Suite 1600 - International Centre
900 Second Avenue South
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-3319
Phone: (612) 334-3222 Fax: (612) 334-3312

PDS:nhw

01/10/2001 AWONDAF1 00000081 09136483

01 FC:221

135.00 OP

RECEIVED
JAN 11 2001
TC 1200 MAIL ROOM



THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant :	Kumar et al.	
Applic No.:	09/136,483	
Filed :	August 19, 1998	Group Art Unit: 1755
For :	ALUMINUM OXIDE PARTICLES	Examiner: M. Marcheschi
Docket No.:	N19.12-0016	

INTERVIEW SUMMARY

BOX AF
Assistant Commissioner for Patents
Washington, D.C. 20231

I HEREBY CERTIFY THAT THIS PAPER IS
BEING SENT BY U.S. MAIL, FIRST
CLASS, TO THE ASSISTANT
COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS,
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20231. THIS

02 DAY OF January, 2001.
Robert D. Dardi
PATENT ATTORNEY

Sir:

Applicants thank the Examiner for the courtesy extended to Applicants undersigned representative in a telephone interview on June 6, 2000. Applicants representative described to the Examiner how the particle size distribution differs from the average particles size, and associated differences between the prior art and the claimed invention. Applicants representative argued that the prior art did not disclose a method for producing the claimed particles. The Examiner suggested providing evidence of unexpected properties. Applicants representative indicated that such results were not needed if the compositions were new and the prior art did not suggest a method of producing the claimed compositions.

RECEIVED
JAN 11 2001
TC 1700 MAIL ROOM

The Director is authorized to charge any fee deficiency required by this paper or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 23-1123.

Respectfully submitted,

WESTMAN, CHAMPLIN & KELLY, P.A.

By: Peter S. Dardi
Peter S. Dardi, Ph.D., Reg. No. 39,650
Suite 1600 - International Centre
900 Second Avenue South
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-3319
Phone: (612) 334-3222 . Fax: (612) 334-3312

PSD:nhw